GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

Public Services – Revenue Department – Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) – Disciplinary proceedings under rule – 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991 – Articles of charge – Issued.

REVENUE (VIGILANCE-I) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.603 **Dated:17.06.2025**
Read:

G.O.Ms.No.210, Revenue (Vig.I) Dept., Dt.17.06.2025

-0o0-

ORDER:

In pursuance to the orders issued vide G.O read above, it is proposed to hold an enquiry against Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991.

2. The substance of the imputations of misconduct or misbehaviour in respect of which the inquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of articles of charge (Annexure- I). A statement of imputations of misconduct/ misbehaviour in support of each article of charge is enclosed (Annexure-II). A list of documents by which, and a list of witnesses by whom, the articles of charge proposed to be sustained are also enclosed (Annexures-III)

3. Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) is directed to submit, within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order, a written statement of his defence.

4. Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) is informed that an inquiry will be held only in respect of those articles of charge as are not admitted. He should, therefore, specifically admit or deny each article of charge.

5. Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the date specified in para 3 above, further action will be processed based on the material available.

6. Attention of Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) is invited to Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, under which no Government Servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear up on any superior authority to further his interest in respect of matter spertaining to her service under the Government. If any representation is received on her behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings, it will be presumed that Sri A.Krishna Rao, the then DM, APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired) is aware of such are presentation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against her for violation of Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

(P.T.O)

7. The receipt of the Order be acknowledged.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

G JAYALAKSHMI
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (FAC)

To
Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then AM (T), APSCSCL, Kakinada District (Retired)
(Through CAF&CS Dept., A.P Sectt., Velagapudi, for service and to return the served copy with dated acknowledgement immediately (By RPAD))
The CAF&CS(CS-I) Dept., A.P Sectt., Velagapudi.
The VC&MD, A.P State Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Vijayawada
The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, A.P., Mangalagiri
Copy to:
The District Collector, Kakinada District.
The DG, V&E, G.A(V&E) Dept., Pandit Nehru Bus Station, Vijayawada.
SF/SC.
.

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-I

STATEMENT OF ARTCLES OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI B.NAGESWARA RAO, THE THEN AM (T), APSCSCL, KAKINADA DISTRICT (RETIRED)

ARTICLE OF CHARGE-I:

That Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(T). APSCSCL, Kakinada intentionally did not mention in the note file that Sri B.Srinivas is the existing Stage-I contractor for transporting rice from FCI godowns to MLS Points in the district and by suppressing the same acted dishonestly to do favour to the then paddy transport contractor which is nothing but a misconduct under Regulation 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence. malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft. fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE -II:

That Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(T), APSCS-Kakinada being responsible officer, has utterly failed to communicate information on the appointment of transport contractor to PPC/Rice Mill/farmer/Medical/officials and also failed to give wide publicity among the farmer community due to which in many of the Instances farmers themselves transported the paddy to mills and thereby gave the scope for huge misappropriation of public money by then transport contractor. The act of the officer construes misconduct under Regulation of 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence. malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE -III:

That Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(M. APSCSCL. Kakinada, being a responsible officer has shown dereliction in appraising the DM about the actual requirement of truck sheets against the estimated quantities of paddy for transportation acted negligently in ensuring the printing and distribution of sufficient truck sheet books and thereby resulting into such huge manipulation in transportation claims. The act of the individual is a misconduct under Regulation 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence, malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE -IV

That Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(T). APSCSCL, Kakinada has acted negligently in verifying the actual amount required as Security Deposit while approving the proposal for returning the Rs.5,00,000/- to the

transport contractor. Hence, the act of the officer. instead of retaining the amount of Rs.5,00,000/- allowing to be returned the amount to the transport contractor, is construing misconduct on his part for which he shall be held responsible under Regulation 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence. malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE –V

That as per the V&E Report, the transport contractor has submitted truck sheets for a quantity of 1.45.822.301 MT as on 12.02.2015. The remaining truck sheets were not submitted by the transport contractor in the O/o DM. Civil Supplies, it was not ascertained on which date the transport contractor has submitted the remaining truck sheets. Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(T). APSCSCL, Kakinada. instead of rejecting the claims, processed the claims. The act of the officer is undesirable thereby resulted in huge misappriation of public money and the same construes misconduct under Regulation 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence, malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE –VI

That, during the V& E Inspection, in some of the claims submitted by the transport contractor it was noticed that 3480 trips of the transport vehicles were recorded as more than 3 times in a single day which is practically not possible and For example vehicle No:AP 05 TT 6381 has scored 16 trips on 20.12.2014 which is highly impossible and nothing but fake, even then the officer has allowed the payments to the then transport contractor. The act of the Officer involves moral turpitude in discharging his legitimate duties and construes a misconduct under Regulation 24 (κ) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence, malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

ARTICLE OF CHARGE –VII

That Sri B.Nageswara Rao, the then Assistant Manager(T), APSCSCL, Kakinada, being responsible officer, has utterly failed in discharging his legitimate duties by acting negligently in ensuring the proper verification of records before making payments to transport contractor against the truck sheets in which non transport vehicle numbers were posted and the same is not desirable on his part and there by allowed for such a huge misappropriation of public money, and as such the act of the officer amounts to misconduct under Regulation 24 (k) r/w 24 (d) of APSCSCL Employees Conduct, Discipline & Appeal Regulations.

Regulation 24(k): Habitual negligence or neglect of work or gross negligence, malignantly or slowing down of work

Regulation 24 (d): Theft, fraud, dishonestly in connection with the Corporation's business or property.

Thus the Charge.

G JAYALAKSHMI
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (FAC)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-II

STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT OR MISBEHAVIOUR IN SUPPPORT OF THE ARTICLES OF CHARGE FRAMED AGAINST SRI B.NAGESWARA RAO, THE THEN AM (T), APSCSCL, KAKINADA DISTRICT (RETIRED).

The officer has signed in all the note orders and played a key role right from the appointment of the transport contractor. He did not mentioned in the note file that Sri B.Srinivas is the existing Stage-1 contractor for transporting rice from FCI godowns to MLS Points in the district. He did not mention the rates under Stage-1 Contract. As per the tender clause. It is prohibited that the existing contractors from participating in paddy transportation tenders.

2. The officer has failed to communicate the issue of appointment of transport contractor to PPC/Rice Mill/farmer/Medical/officials. He visited only 3 or 4 PPCs out of 180 centers and neglected his duties in visiting the PPC centres to ascertain the problems of the farmers. This attitude of the officer paved way to the transport contractor to claim undeserved Govt. money. The officer has not submitted any tour diary to his superior officer. He has neglected to monitor the process and thereby failed in giving/ensuring wide publicity among the farmer community/PPC/Rice Miller/officials regarding the appointment of transport contractor.

3. On 01.11.2014, the then DM has approved note orders to print 300 books of truck sheets each contains 50 leaves in triplicate. Thus, he ordered for 300x50 15,000 truck sheets only. He knows that nearly 8,00,000 Mts of paddy is to be procured in the Khariff 2014-15. Nearly 40,000 truck sheets shall be made available but the then O/o DM ordered to print only 15,000 truck sheets i.e., 300 books. Later they have printed another 800 books but not distributed to the PPCs. On perusal of the note file, it is noticed that the books were preserved for the usage for the Rabi season. The above officer as a Asst. Manager(Tech) being a responsible officer shall have appraised to the DM about the actual requirement of truck sheets against the estimated quantities of paddy for transportation but shown his dereliction in printing and distribution of truck sheets books. But he did not do so thereby allowed scope for such misappropriation.

4. Security deposit of Rs.30,00,000/- was obtained from the contractor but returned Rs.5,00,000/- to the transport contractor without verifying the agreement properly stating that it was mentioned Rs.25,00,000/- in numerical and rupees Thirty Lakhs in words. The officer shall have acted consciously by verifying the actual amount required as Security Deposit while approving the proposal for returning the Rs.5,00,000/- to the transport contractor. Hence, the act of the officer, instead of retaining the amount of Rs.5,00,000/-allowing to be returned the amount to the transport contractor, is construing misconduct on his part for which he shall be held responsible.

5. During the course of inspection by V&E officials, the said officer instead of rejecting the claim to the extent for which transport contractor has not submitted the truck sheets he has processed the claim ignoring the irregularities while doing so as a result excess payment was made. As per the V&E Report the transport contractor has submitted truck sheets for a quantity of 1,45,822.301 MT as on 12.02.2015. The remaining truck sheets were not submitted by the transport contractor in the O/o DM, Civil Supplies, it was not ascertained on which date the transport contractor has submitted the remaining truck sheets. The officer, instead of rejecting the clause processed/approved the claims. He failed to maintain the rule provision on the note file and simply stating that all the payments were made with the approval of the Joint Collector. Therefore, he shall be made responsible for making excess payments to the transport contractor in claiming of bills regarding agency Mandals.

6. During the course of inspection, in respect to the number of trips which are practically possible in a single day, it was noticed that 3480 trips were recorded as more than 3 times in a single day which is practically not possible. Loading and

unloading of paddy at farm gate and at rice mill will ordinarily takes 3 to 4 hours and the period of transport is 30 min. By applying this analogy at a maximum 3 trips per a day for a lorry and a maximum of 4 trips a day for a tractor is only possible But during the verification, it is noticed that 635 truck vehicles have scored more than 3 trips a day. 3480 number of trucks sheets was recorded as more than 3 trips a day. On verification of the truck sheets it is noticed that 635 no of truck sheets were submitted by the transport contractor in this aspect. For example vehicle No:AP 05 TT 6381 has scored 16 trips on 20.12.2014 which is practically not possible.

This indicates the transport contractor has fabricated the truck sheets. The transport contractor has submitted these types of truck sheets for a quantity of 55149 MT, therefore the said officer has malafidely acted while discharging his duties by allowing 3480 truck sheets which were shown as operated more than 3 trips a day to benefit the then paddy transportation contractor.

7. The said officer being responsible shall ensure that only the genuine transport vehicles are used for transportation of paddy and the claims shall be allowed with such vehicle number but not with non transport vehicles. In fact the transport contractor has submitted the truck sheets having certain vehicle numbers and on verification through the transport department Web Site. It was noticed as other than transport vehicles le motor cycles, autos, school buses etc., against which payments were made without proper verification. This indicates that the said officer has failed to process the claim properly and therefore he shall be made responsible for allowing the claims with false vehicle no.s and allowed payments for 62 non transport vehicles without proper verification.

G JAYALAKSHMI
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (FAC)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-III

LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH THE ARTICLES OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI B.NAGESWARA RAO, THE THEN AM (T), APSCSCL, KAKINADA DISTRICT (RETIRED), ARE POPOSED TO BE SUSTANED.

@@@

-Nil-

G JAYALAKSHMI
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (FAC)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-IV

LIST OF WITNESSES BY WHOM THE ARTICLES OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI B.NAGESWARA RAO, THE THEN AM (T), APSCSCL, KAKINADA DISTRICT (RETIRED), ARE POPOSED TO BE SUSTANED.

@@@

-Nil-

G JAYALAKSHMI
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (FAC)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER